

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TERRY MONTGOMERY,

Petitioner,

No. CIV S-04-2116 FCD DAD P

vs.

W.A. DUNCAN, et al.,

Respondents.

ORDER

_____/

Petitioner has filed a motion requesting a response to his traverse and an inquiry regarding the status of his case. Court records indicate that the respondents filed an answer on April 24, 2006 and that petitioner filed his traverse on May 8, 2006.¹ The case is now submitted and in due course, the court will issue its findings and recommendations. Petitioner is informed that because of the court's caseload, a response to inquiries about the status of his case cannot always be provided. As long as the petitioner keeps the court informed of any change of address, no further action is necessary.

////

////

¹ Petitioner is advised that a response to a traverse is not an authorized pleading and that respondents have not been ordered to file a response to his traverse.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Petitioner's March 30, 2007 motion shall be placed in the file;
2. Petitioner's motion for a response to his traverse is denied; and
3. Petitioner's motion for a case status report is granted.

DATED: April 16, 2007.



DALE A. DROZD
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DAD:4
mont2116.stat